

Application No. 09/998,601
Supplemental Amendment "C" dated January 9, 2006
Reply to Office Action mailed September 9, 2005

REMARKS

These remarks are responsive to the Office Action mailed September 9, 2005 (hereinafter referred to as the "Office Action"). These remarks are supplemental to the response filed on January 4, 2006 (hereinafter referred to as the "prior response"). Please consider these remarks in conjunction with the remarks of the prior response. In the remarks of the prior response, we state as follows:

Section 9 of the Office Action rejects Claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okumura-US. As explained above, however, Okumura-US fails to teach or suggest a large number of the features recited in Claim 1, from which Claim 5 depends. Furthermore, Claim 1 is not rendered unpatentable over Okumura-US. Therefore, Claim 5 is not unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) in view of Okumura-US for at least the reasons provided above with respect to Claim 1. Therefore, the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of Claim 3 should be withdrawn.

However, Section 9 of the Office Action rejects Claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okumura-US, not Claim 5. Thus, the rejection is rendered moot. In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Application No. 09/998,601
Supplemental Amendment "C" dated January 9, 2006
Reply to Office Action mailed September 9, 2005

Dated this 9th day of January, 2006.

Respectfully submitted,



ADRIAN J. LEE
Registration No. 42,785
Attorney for Applicant
Customer No. 022913

AJL:ds
AJL0000000956V001